Grammatical Relations in Mon. Syntactic tests in an isolating language

Jenny, Mathias

Abstract: This study investigates the relevance of the generalized semantic roles S, A, P, T, and G and whether there are constructions that treat subsets of these identically, defining Grammatical relations in Mon, (Austroasiatic). After establishing the notion of transitivity in Mon, the study looks at syntactic constructions that are cross-linguistically found to be relevant the selection of Grammatical Relations, including word order, case marking, control, reflexivization, among others. The results show that Mon exhibits identical treatment of S and A ('Subject') in most constructions, less prominently of P and T ('Direct Object'), as well as a subset P, G in at least one construction. Grammatical Relations are found to be relevant for the description and analysis of Mon.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.123.04jen

Grammatical Relations in Mon - syntactic tests in an isolating language

Mathias Jenny, University of Zurich

1. Background

Mon is an Austroasiatic language of the Monic group, spoken by about 800'000 people mainly in southern Myanmar (Burma) and a few communities in central and northern Thailand. In Mon communities in Myanmar, Mon is spoken in daily life in most situations, though it is not widely taught at school or used in the media, apart from a few journals (in print and online) and entertainment media. Almost all speakers are bilingual, speaking also Burmese at least to some extent, with proficiency in Burmese apparently increasing in the recent past. In Thailand, the Mon language has been under heavy influence from Thai for many decades and its use is receding. All speakers are bilingual with Thai. For most speakers Thai is the language they are most fluent in, with Mon as 'native' language which they speak to varying degrees of proficiency. Many Mon in Thailand can at best be considered semi-speakers.

The Mon language has a documented history going back to the 6th century, which allows for diachronic studies, though the inscriptional material is restricted to the formal level of the language. While Old Mon had an elaborated system of derivational morphology using pre- and infixes, the productivity of these morphological processes are all but lost in the modern language. Only one prefix, *hə-*, retains some degree of productivity and has a wide range of functions, including nominalization, causativization, and adverbialization, among others. Like other languages of Southeast Asia, Mon makes heavy use of multi-verb predicates, with all verbal elements being adjacent in most cases. The omission of known or retrievable arguments and adjuncts is frequent, but non-specific or non-specified arguments such as 'someone' and 'something' must be overtly expressed. Unlike its neighbors Burmese, Thai, and Karen, Mon does not make regular use of nominal classifiers, but allows the direct combination of nouns with numerals and other modifiers. No case marking exists, though in some contexts a kind of differential subject marking seems to be emerging. The word order is flexible in most cases and based on information structure, but subordinate clauses regularly exhibit fixed order of SV and AVP. In most cases, modifiers follow the modified elements, with the exception of the prenominal interrogative *mùʔ* 'what (kind of)'.

The present study first briefly establishes the notion of transitivity and arguments in Mon before looking at ways to establish grammatical relations as sets of arguments relevant in different syntactic constructions. These constructions include, among others, word order, case marking, and control verbs. The main questions to be answered in this study are to what extent S, A, P, T, and G as generalized semantic roles (neutralizations of semantic roles) are relevant in an adequate description of Mon, and in which constructions, if any, which of these roles are treated identically. In other words, are there any relevant subsets of grammatical roles, such as 'subject', generally taken to consist of the set {S, A}.

Based on original texts, both spoken and written, as well as elicited data, this study constitutes the first attempt to establish grammatical relations in Mon. As basic typological theoretical background of the study serve publications by Van Valin & LaPolla (1997), Bickel (2011), and

Witzlack-Makarevich (2011), among others.

2. Transitivity in Mon - syntactic and semantic

Testing syntactic transitivity in Mon is straightforward in most cases. Transitive verbs take a direct object (not marked by any preposition or similarly functioning marker), which may cover a wide range of semantic roles, while intransitive verbs take no object. Only one verb is regularly used in ditransitive expressions, namely *kɒ* 'give', which also covers a range of other functions, including the marking of recipients and beneficiaries. More difficult is the testing of semantic transitivity, and a number of studies have proposed different sets of relevant parameters, in some cases aiming at distinguishing 'high' from 'low' transitivity (e.g. Hopper & Thompson 1980; Kittilä 2002; Næss 2007). The transitivity types in Mon are briefly illustrated in the following subsections.

2.1 *Intransitive expressions*

Intransitive verbs take only one argument, labeled S for sole (or single) argument.[1] The semantic role of the S argument can be agent-like, as in *kwac* 'walk' or patient like, as in *mìp* 'be happy'. These semantic roles are neutralized in S in Mon. There is no indication of any split-S or fluid-S features in any construction. Intransitive verbs include non-directed motion verbs such as *kwac* 'walk' and *pɔ* 'fly', as well as the existential copula *nùm* 'exist, be somewhere' among others. Examples (1a-d) illustrate the impossibility of these verbs to co-occur with unmarked NPs.

(1) a. **ʔuə mìp puə* intended: 'I enjoyed the theater.'
1SG happy performance

b. **ɗɛh khyɒt kəhaŋ* intended: 'He died from thirst.'
3 die thirst

c. **rɔ̀ə kwac phya* intended: 'The friend walked to the market.'
friend walk market

d. **mìʔ nùm hɒəʔ* intended: 'Mother is at home.'
mother exist house

Intransitive verbs, especially manner-of-motion verbs, can combine with directionals to introduce an NP expressing the goal, the combination being syntactically transitive.

2.2 *Transitive expressions*

Transitive verbs take two arguments, labeled A for the more agent-like and P for the less agent-like (more patient- or goal-like) argument. Transitive verbs take an unmarked P argument denoting any of a wide range of semantic relations. The choice of NP that can occur with a given verb is restricted by the semantic properties of the verb and the NP. Some verbs are more flexible than others in their choice of object. Some V N combinations result in grammatical, but non-sensical expressions, while others are ungrammatical. In the latter case, the choice of an inappropriate NP as object results in an ungrammatical expression. This is especially the case with directed motion

1 I use the labels S, A, P, T, and G in the sense introduced in Bickel (2011) and Witzlack-Makarevich (2011). P is used for Patient (Bickel 2011 uses O for this notion).

verbs (directionals), which only combine directly with NPs expressing conventionalized locations. Examples (2a-b) illustrate the former, (2c-f) the latter kind of transitive verbs. Notice that 'eat trousers' in (2b) is semantically odd in the real world, but not ungrammatical. It is conceivable to use this expression in a given context. (2d) and (2f) on the other hand, are grammatical only with the locative marker *ɗɔ̀ə* 'in, at', because *ka* 'car' and *nɔm-chuʔ* 'tree' are not convetionalized locations like *phɛ̀ə* 'school, monastery' and *phya* 'market'.

(2) a. *ciəʔ* *pɤŋ* 'eat rice'
eat cooked.rice

b. *ʔciəʔ* *hɒəʔ* 'eat a house'
eat house

c. *mɔ̀ŋ* *phɛ̀ə* 'stay in school'
stay school

d. *mɔ̀ŋ* **(ɗɔ̀ə)* *ka* 'stay in the car'
stay LOC car

e. *ʔa* *phya* 'go to the market'
go market

f. *ʔa* **(ɗɔ̀ə)* *nɔm.chuʔ* 'go to the tree'
go LOC tree

Not all directional verbs have the combine with the same set of goal NPs. While *ʔa* 'go' and *cao* 'return', for example, cannot take *nɔm-chuʔ* 'tree' as direct object, the semantically similar verbs *cɒp* 'arrive' can combine with the same NP in the expression *cɒp nɔm-chuʔ* 'reach the tree'.

2.3 *Ditransitive expressions*

Ditransitive verbs take three arguments, labeled A, T, and G.[2] There is only one real syntactic ditransitive verb in Mon, namely *kɒ* 'give'. Other semantically ditransitive expressions obligatorily combine with *kɒ* 'give'.[3] The word order in ditransitive constructions is AVGT, as seen in (3) with the possibility to front either G or T to clause initial position for pragmatic reasons, as seen in (4).

(3) *ɗɛh* *kɒ* *ʔuə* *lòc* *mùə.*
3 give 1SG text one
'He gave me a book.'

(4) *lòc* *kɔ̀h* *rɔ̀ə* *kɒ* *lɔ̀* *ʔuə.*
text MEDL companion give deposit 1SG
'That book a friend gave me.'

Other expressions involving three arguments combine a main verb with the secondary verb *kɒ* 'give', as seen in (5), where the omission of *kɒ* 'give' would result in an ungrammatical expression.

2 The A argument of ditransitive clauses is identical in all constructional properties to the A argument of transitive clauses. No difference is notion (such as A vs. A_{DITR}) is therefore adopted here.

3 For some speakers, a few other verbs, such as *pəciəʔ* 'feed', can be used as ditransitives with no additional marker on the recipient.

(5) *həɓah kɒ ʔuə lòc tɤʔ.*
show give 1SG text DIST
'Show me that book over there.'

Generally, the addition of *kɒ* 'give' to transitive verbs results in ditransitive multi-verb predicates, usually with benefactive reading. The P argument of the transitive expressions is treated as T in the extended predicate. Where there is different treatment between the non-A arguments in ditransitive constructions, T is regularly treated like P in transitive constructions. This is the case for example in transitivity harmony in multi-verb predicates (see 2.4 and 3.4). In terms of word order, it is G that gets identical treatment with P, occupying the immediate postverbal position (see 3.1).

2.4 *Semantic transitivity*

While syntactic transitivity is determined by the number of arguments a predicate takes, semantic transitivity is a scalar notion, based on a number of factors, including volitionality of the agent, completeness of the action, affectedness of the patient, and many more (see e.g. Hopper & Thompson 1980; Kittilä 2002; Næss 2007). The prototypical transitive event is one where an agent willfully acts on a patient which is totally affected, that is, whose state is markedly different after the event than it was before the event. An event is less transitive if one or more factors are absent. The relative weight of individual factors are not determined or considered relevant by all authors, though they are potentially important. Kittilä (2002) distinguishes four phases of an event that are important to the notion of low versus high transitivity, namely 'planning', 'initiation', 'event', and 'result'. Only if the event actually comes about and has a result one can speak of high transitivity. The notion of semantic transitivity is syntactically relevant in Mon as it determines the choice of secondary verbs in multi-verb constructions. If the P or T argument is mainly affected by the event, the secondary verbs exhibit transitivity harmony with the main verb. In all other cases, including affectedness of the S or A argument, no transitivity harmony is found. The choice of the form of secondary verbs, especially directionals, is obviously based on the affectedness of the P/T argument. Affected P/T trigger causative directionals, while non-affected P/T group with S/A in triggering non-causative forms. This will be illustrated in more detail in section 3.4.

3. Argument selectors in Mon

As a largely isolating language, Mon does not have any overt markers expressing grammatical relations; there are neither case markers nor verb agreement. On the syntactic level, the notion of Subject competes with Topic as privileged syntactic argument (PSA) in a number of constructions (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:281ff). The basic word order can be described as SV and AVP/AVGT, though fronting of topical (or focal) P, T or G is frequent, as are unexpressed arguments. In the following sections a number of argument selectors relevant to different degrees in Mon in establishing sets of arguments will be presented.

3.1 *Word order*

The basic word order in Mon is verb medial, or SV, AVP, and AVGT. The preverbal slot is thus occupied by either the S or A argument, as seen in examples (6) to (8).

(6) *rɔ̀ə krìp ʔa.*
friendrun go
'The friend ran away.'

(7) *ʔuə pɔk lɔ̀ kəraŋ.*
1SG open deposit door
'I opened the door.'

(8) *dɛ̀h kɒ lɔ̀ ʔuə lòc mùə.*
3 give deposit 1SG text one
'He gave me a book.'

Though the basic word order suggests that the GR 'subject' as the set {S, A}, word order changes and omission of arguments are frequent, so that in many clauses other arrangements of constituents occur. Fronting for pragmatic reasons is frequent, involving both topicalization and focusing of the fronted argument or adjunct. If the fronted argument is focused, it is regularly marked by the focus marker *raʔ*, while topical preverbal arguments are optionally marked by the medial demonstrative *kɔ̀h*. If the P argument is fronted position, the resulting word order is PAV. The A argument can secondarily be fronted, resulting in APV, but only with an intonational pause and optional resumptive pronoun of A in the preverbal position of the clause. This corresponds to what Van Valin & LaPolla (1997:36) call the 'left detached position', that is, the position that is outside the core [or the clause?]. In these cases, A and/or P usually carry a topic marker, such as the medial demonstrative *kɔ̀h* (see Jenny 2009).

Some cases of VS occur when V is topical and S is predicative. Postverbal S occurs mostly with existential verbs. No occurrence of a transitive verb with postverbal A is found in the corpus, and elicited expressions of the form VAP or PVA are not accepted by native speakers. Postverbal A can only occur as anti-topic or after-thought, that is, outside the clause proper. The possibility of S to occur in the postverbal position, usually the place of P or G arguments, cannot be taken as indication of ergative alignment, but is rather he result of the semantics and information structure of the expressions invilved. Examples (9) to (12) illustrate the postposed S as opposed to preverbal S, with different information structural implications.

(9) *nùm mɔ̀ŋ chaʔ pʁŋ (hwaʔ ʔɒt ʔa yaʔ).*
exist stay EXCL cooked.rice curry all go NSIT
'There's only rice, the curry is used up.

(10) *pʁŋ nùm mɔ̀ŋ ɲìʔ thɔ̀ raʔ.*
cooked.rice exist stay little only FOC
'There's only a little bit of rice.'

(11) *seh mɔ̀ŋ chaʔ ʔuə.*
remain stay EXCL 1SG
'I'm the only one left.'

(12) *ʔuə* *seh* *mɔ̀ŋ* *phɤh.*
1SG remain stay still
'I'm still here.'

While the word order is generally very flexible in Mon, it is much more restricted in subordinate clauses, including dummy causatives (cf. Enfield 2009:811), where only SV and AVP/AVGT are acceptable. No fronting of arguments or peripheral elements within the subordinate clause is possible. This restriction applies only to subordinate clauses with clause-initial subordinators, as in example (13), but not to more recently developed clauses with clause-final quasi-subordinators, as in (14), where the P argument *puə* 'performance, show' occurs before the verb *lèh* 'dance' (see Jenny 2011).

(13) *ŋuə* *pèh* *ʔat* *pəraŋ.tɔə* *ŋuə* *kətɒ* *tɔ̀h* *mənìh* *tɤʔ,*
day 2 beg present day arise be human DIST

yɔ̀.raʔ *pèh* *hùʔ* *ʔat* *ʔəkhoŋ* *chan* *mə= kɛ̀h …*
COND 2 NEG beg permission love REL=say

'that day when you asked me for a birthday present, if you hadn't asked for the permission to love me, …' (cl_ck_ca)

(14) *puə* *nɔʔ* *lèh* *hùʔ* *toə* *pùh* *teh,* *cao* *ʔa* *teh,*
performance PROX dance NEG finish NEG TOP return go TOP

ʔəca *càt* *həlah* *ʔəkhoŋ* *ha.*
master theater free permission Q

'If you're not finished with performing this show yet and you (want to) go back, will the theater director give you permission?' (KM_SR)

The underlying restriction obviously is that fronting is not possible within a subordinate clause, but only to a preclausal position (outside the subordinate clause). In subordinate clauses with clause final conjunctions (or conjunction-like markers), there is no difference in the surface word order if the fronted element appears in clause initial or preclausal position and the restriction is practically canceled.

Word order is an argument selector in that in pragmatically unmarked clauses S or A precede the verb, while P and G immediately follow it. Word order in Mon therefore defines the sets {S, A} and {P, G} as grammatical relations. These coincide with what is traditionally called 'subject' and (primary) 'object'.

3.2 *Case marking*

There is no case marking in Mon for core arguments, including G in ditransitive expressions with *kɒ* 'give', as seen in example (3). Non-core roles, including G in ditransitive expressions involving verbs other than *kɒ* are marked either by prepositions, as seen in (15), or by verbs or relator nouns, as in (16). These prepositions are in most cases semantically specific, with the exception of *kɒ* 'oblique, dative', which covers a wide range of functions.[4]

4 This preposition *kɒ* is homnymous with the verb *kɒ* 'give', with which it partly overlaps in function. In literary Mon,

(15) *ɗɔ̀ə* ‘in, at’
nù ‘from, since’
sɒm ‘(together) with, both x and y’
ʔəraŋ ‘for’
kɒ ‘to, for, by, with’

Use of verbs and relator nouns to express more concrete relations:

(16) *cɒp* ‘arrive > until, up to’
klɒʔ ‘cross > across’
kɒ ‘give > for, to’
ʔətao ‘top > on (top of)’
ʔəhmɔ ‘lower part > under’

Case markers or prepositions are relevant to grammatical relations in that they distinguish all core arguments from peripheral arguments. The former occur without marking, the latter are obligatorily marked. The G argument is marked in ditransitive expressions with predicates other than *kɒ* ‘give’. In the latter case, the literary language regularly uses the dative preposition *kaoʔ*. As this marker became homonymous with the verb *kɒ* ‘give’ in colloquial Mon, we may assume that an original structure A *kɒ kɒ* G T was reduced to A *kɒ* G T. In terms of case marking there is a neutralization of {S, A, P, T}, as opposed to G.

While core arguments are not usually case marked in Mon, there are some cases of contrastive marking on S/A. The noun *kəpac* ‘side’ can be used in modern prose to foreground the S or A argument in a clause. This use, though a rather transparent reanalysis within Mon, may be influenced by similar constructions in Burmese (see Jenny & Hnin Tun 2013). In sentences (17) and, probably to a lesser extent, (18), the literal spatial meaning of *kəpac* ‘side’ is still present.

(17) *hɒm* *klah~klah* *teh* *ʔəci.cɔ̀n* *chak.kway* *kɔ̀h* ***kəpac***
speak clear~RED TOP arrangement present.HON MEDL side

hɔŋsawətɒə *ʔɔp* *kɒ* *ɓɤ̀ʔ* *nɔ̀n.say,* ***kəpac*** *ʔɔŋ.cèyyaʔ* *kɔ̀h*
PN hand.over give F PN side PN MEDL

ʔɔp *kɒ* *ɲèh* *prèə* *həkao* *həmɛ̀ə* *kyɛ~kyɛ* *kɒm*
hand.over give person woman sort Burmese beautiful~RED also

hɒm *ciəʔ* *kɤ̀ʔ* *raʔ.*
speak eat get FOC

‘To state it clearly, one could well say that if the arrangements had been carried out further, the land of Hamsavati would have surrendered Non Say, while the king Aung Zeyya would have handed over a beautiful Burmese woman.’ (saksoy_hongsa)

(18) *mùə* *kəpac* *tɤʔ* *phɤŋ* *ceh* *ʔa* *toə,* ***kəpac*** *mɔ̀n.sɒc* *lɛ*
one side DIST phone descend go finish side PN ADD

the oblique preposition is *kaoʔ*, going back to Old Mon *ku* ‘dative’, which later merged with the verb *kɒ*.

həlɛ̀h	*phyeh*	*phʊŋ*	*sa~sa*	*raʔ.*
release	CAUS.descend	phone	slowly~RED	FOC

'After the phone went down on one end, Mon Sak too let the phone down slowly.' (cl_ck_ca)

In sentences (19) and (20), the literal meaning of *kəpac* 'side' is less evident and the noun has become a marker of contrastive S or A.

(19)

kəpac	*wətɒə*	*mùʔ*	*tɔ̀h*	*mɔ̀ŋ*	*lɛ*	*hùʔ*	*həca*	*klʊŋ*	*pùh.*
side	PN	what	be	stay	ADD	NEG	consider	come	NEG

'[He] didn't think about how Wati was doing at all.' (cl_ck_ca)

(20)

həmùh	*mùʔ*	*paʔ*	*pèh*	*klɛʔ*	*mɔ̀ŋ*	*pəwɒŋ*	*ɓɒt*	*pəsɔn*	*hətaoʔ*
now	what	do	2SG	disappear	stay	extent	about	five	moon

kɔ̀h	*rao,*	***kəpac***	*wətɒə*	*hman*	*klʊŋ*	*pərɒŋ*	*mùə*	*wɛ̀ə*	*kɒm*	*ha.*
MEDL	Q	side	PN	ask	come	matter	one	time	also	Q

'Now, how come you have disappeared for about five months, and has Wati asked about [you] even once?' (cl_ck_ca)

This contrastive marker does not occur with other arguments. It therefore defines the set {S, A} as grammatical relation.

3.3 *Voice*

3.3.1 Passive

There is no real passive in common use in colloquial Mon. The construction that is closest in function to a passive is the (usually adversative) construction involving *tɛ̀h* '(be) hit' or *tɛ̀h tɔ̀ŋ* 'have to accept, endure'. These quasi passive constructions can be used to promote P, more rarely T, (but not G) to privileged argument or pivot, but usually only in situations where the P is negatively affected by the event. Adversative (or adversity) passive constructions have been described for Japanese (Kuno 1973; Shibatani 1990), the term being subsequently applied to other languages with different meanings. The fact that the promoted argument is adversely affected by the event explains why T arguments are not usually involved in this construction, as they are typically inanimate or non-human. Examples (21) and (22) illustrate the promotion of P to privileged syntactic argument (see Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:281ff) by use of the simple verb *tɛ̀h* '(be) hit, come into contact with, have to, do accidentally', expressing non-agentivity or non-volitionality in general. Directionals occurring with *tɛ̀h* appear in the basic intransitive form, showing that the original P is indeed treated as A of the matrix clause, as seen in (23).

(21)

həmɛ̀ə	*pɔn*	*ɗɔ̀ə*	*kwan*	*poy*	*kɔ̀h*	*ha,*	*ʔəpho*	***tɛ̀h***	*ɗɛh*	*kok*
Burmese	shoot	LOC	village	1PL	MEDL	Q	grandfather	hit	3	call

pəkom	*siəŋ.*
CAUS.come.together	be.so

'The Burmese were shooting in our village, right, and grandfather was called to a meeting by them.' (WW2)

(22) *yɔ̀.raʔ hùʔ cao chak toə yɛ̀m mɔ̀ŋ nɛm mə=kɛ̀h*
COND NEG return connect finish weep stay yet REL=say

tɛ̀h *tak kɒ lɛ̀ʔ ɓɔ noŋ.*
hit beat OBL stick rattan ASRT

'If [you] don't go home now and continue weeping, [you]'ll be beaten with a rattan cane.' (MKP)

(23) *mənɨh-kraoh kwi-lɔ̀n ɲèh tɛ̀h* ***ʔa*** *pəlɔt kɔ̀h ʔuə tɛm raʔ.*
human-male cart-tread person hit go thief MEDL 1SG know FOC
'I know the man whose bicycle was stolen.' (Nai Sac Lun 2013:338)

In example (24), the more formal expression *tɛ̀h tɔ̀ŋ* 'have to accept' is used.

(24) *pənet həraʔ tɛ̀h lɔ̀ phɔ̀ə nɔʔ kɔ̀h tɒəlaʔ.pɒn tɒn tɛ̀h*
wound scar hit deposit danger PROX MEDL monk ascend hit[5]

mənɔh ***tɛ̀h*** ***tɔ̀ŋ*** *tak lɔ̀ kɒ ləkyac hnòk ʔəca ha kyac?*
jackfruit hit receive beat deposit OBL monk big master Q holy

'The wounds and scars you got here, did you unintentionally climb the jackfruit tree and were beaten by the abbot, reverend?' (MKP)

The A argument *dɛ̀h* 'he, she, they' in (21) is overtly expressed and not marked as oblique. The oblique marker in (22) is used to introduce the instrument of the activity, with the A omitted. In examples (21) and (22) the structure is biclausal, with the actual event functioning as complement clause of the main predicate *tɛ̀h* '(be) hit, come in contact with, be affected by'. The P is therefore not in fact promoted to 'subject' of a passivized expression, but becomes A of a transitive matrix clause. In example (24), the A of the predicate *tak* 'beat' is demoted grammatically to an oblique role and marked as such by *ka* 'by, with, to'. This construction, unlike the construction with *tɛ̀h*, is syntactically therefore closer to a real passive, though it is not a fully grammaticalized operation applicable to all semantic classes of verbs or to all types of P. As both processes are available only to P (and rarely T) arguments, the quasi-passive can be seen as an argument selector defining P (and T) as grammatical relation, as opposed to S, A and G.

3.3.2 Causative

Mon has two basic types of causative constructions, morphological and periphrastic. Morphological causatives are mostly fossilized, with only limited productivity of the causative prefix *hə-*, which can be applied to some recent loans from Burmese. Although the majority of morphological causatives are lexicalized, their structural build is transparent in most cases, as is their semantics. In causative expressions, the S or A argument of an expression becomes P of the derived expression. The status of the original S/A as P in causative expressions is clearly in that they trigger causative forms of secondary verbs, as seen in (25a, b). Causative directionals and other secondary verbs in multi-verb predicates occur whenever the P or T is affected by the event described by the main predicate (see 3.4).

5 The postverbal function of *tɛ̀h* 'hit' is 'non-volitional, unintentional'. This is syntactically and functionally different from the preclausal 'passive' marker (see Jenny 2005:231ff for details).

(25) a. *həkɔ̀ə* ***tɛt*** ***ʔa*** *nù* *klɔʔ.*
cat exit go ABL garden
'The cat went out of the garden.'

b. *dɛ̀h* ***pətɛt*** ***na*** *həkɔ̀ə* *nù* *klɔʔ.*
3SG CAUS.exit CAUS.go cat ABL garden
'He chased the cat out of the garden.'

In preiphrastic causatives, S/A can be said to remain S/A of a subordinate clause, rather than being P of a single causative clause, with the causer appearing as A of a matrix clause with the verb *kɒ* 'give, let', as seen in (26a, b) and (27a, b). The directional in example (27) appears in the basic (non-causative) form, indicating that the causee is indeed treated as S of its own clause.

(26) a. *ʔuə* ***khyu*** *lòc.*
1SG write text
'I'm writing a letter.'

b. *dɛ̀h* ***kɒ*** *ʔuə* ***khyu*** *lòc.*
3SG give 1SG write text
'He let/made me write a letter.'

(27) a. *ʔuə* ***kwac*** ***ʔa*** *phya.*
1SG walk go market
'I walked to the market.'

b. *dɛ̀h* ***kɒ*** *ʔuə* ***kwac*** ***ʔa*** *phya.*
3SG give 1SG walk go market
'He let/made me walk to the market.'

While periphrastic causatives are not indicative of grammatical relations, morphological causatives select the set {S/A} as a relevant grammatical relation. This makes the morphological causative a valid argument selector in Mon (and many other languages). The neutralization of S and A is restricted, as it does not extend to other types of arguments, and it neutralizes semantic agent and patient in S.

3.4 *Secondary verbs*

As seen in sections 2.4 and 3.3.2, directionals and other secondary verbs appear either in the basic intransitive/non-causative or the derived transitive/causative form, depending of the affectedness of the P (or T) argument. The choice is based on semantic factors (see also Jenny forthc.) with respect to P and T arguments. If the P or T is prominently affected (or set in motion) by the event described in the main predicate, the causative form is used, as seen in examples (28) and (29).

(28) *kyac.hnòk*$_i$ ***həlɛ̀h*** ***na*** *ʔəkùn* *nɔ̀ŋ*$_j$ Ø$_j$ *tɛ̀h* *nìʔmòn* *dɔ̀ə* *mèsəli* *tɤʔ.*
abbot release CAUS.go monk PN hit invite LOC PN DIST
'The abbot let the monk Naing go, he was invited to Mesali village.' (KM_SR)

(29) Ø$_i$ *kəpɔh* *həmoc*$_j$ *toə* *ʔɒt,* Ø$_i$ ***klɔh*** ***thɒʔ*** ***na*** Ø$_j$ *raʔ.*
collect garbage finish all throw discard CAUS.go FOC

'We collected all the garbage and then we threw it away.' (KM_SR)

If it is the S or A arguent that is mainly affected by the event, the non-causative form is chosen, irrespective of the syntactic transitivity of the main predicate. The semantic transitivity in this case can said to be low, as opposed to the high transitivity of events prominently affecting the P or T argument. Examples are given in (30) and (31).

(30) *ɗɛh*$_i$ ***klɒʔ*** ***ʔa*** *nɔm* *sɔt* *pì* *kɔ̀h.*
3SG cross go tree fruit beal MEDL
'It crossed over to the beal tree.' (KM_SR)

(31) Ø$_i$ *krìp* *tɒn* Ø$_i$ ***rɔ̀ŋ*** ***ʔa*** *phɛ̀ə* *kɔʔ.kyac* *tʊʔ,* Ø$_i$ *ɲàt* *hə-ʔɒt.*
run ascend look go monastery PN DIST see ADV-all
'We ran up and looked over to Kaw Kyaik monastery, we could see everything.' (KM_SR)

Crucially, S always triggers the basic form of secondary verbs, irrespective of its being agentive or patientive. The affected patientive S of *khyɒt* 'die' requires the use of intransitive *ʔa* 'go' as secondary verb (*khyɒt ʔa* 'died, passed away'), just like the agentive S of *kwac* 'walk' (*kwac ʔa* 'walked away'). This shows that, though based in semantics, the choice of the form of secondary verbs is determined by syntactic constructions rather than semantics alone. It also shows that S neutralizes the semantic roles of agent and patient, as stated in section 2.1.

The choice of the form of directional verbs is based on the notion of {P, T} as a set of arguments, defining this set as grammatical relation in Mon.

3.5 *Control*

In control verbs, the controller is coreferential with a controllee S or A, which is obligatorily omitted. The controller itself may or may not be overtly expressed. Control verbs in Mon include *məkʊ̀ʔ* 'want to', *hù mòc* 'not want to', *tɛ̀h* 'have to', and others. Examples (32) and (33) illustrate the use of control expressions, with the controller overtly expressed in the former, and omitted in the latter.

(32) *mənìh* *plày* *tùʔtiʔyaʔ* *kɔ̀h*$_i$ *lɛ* *məkʊ̀ʔ* Ø$_i$ *tɛ̀k* *mìt*
human young.man second MEDL ADD DES tie friend

chak *kəwɔɲ* *kɒ* *mìʔ.kon.plɛm* *kɒm* *raʔ.*
connect lover OBL PN also FOC

'Also the second young man wanted to become friends and lovers with Mi Kon Plem.' (MKP)

(33) Ø$_i$ *kəlaŋ* *cɔm* *rɔ̀ŋ* *khyɒt.khyɒt.plɒt.plɒt* *toə* *hmaʔ* Ø$_i$ *məkʊ̀ʔ* Ø$_i$
listen try look certainly finish RSTR DES

həɲòc *dɒp* *lɛ* Ø$_i$ *həɲòc,* Ø$_i$ *hùʔ* *mòc* Ø$_i$ *həɲòc* *lɛ...*
nod head ADD nod NEG DES nod ADD

'Now listen carefully, and when [you] have looked at it thoroughly, if [you] want to nod [your] head, do it, if [you] don't want to nod [your] head, then ... .'(cl_ck_ca)

If the S of the modal (control) verb is not coreferent with S/A of the controlled verb, the dummy causative *kɒ* 'give; let' must be used (see Enfield 2009:811). This is also the case with verbs like 'order', 'request', and others. In both cases, the controllee may or may not be overtly expressed, as seen in examples (34) and (35).

(34) *ʔuə* ***məkɤ̀ʔ*** ***kɒ*** (*pèh*) *ʔa.*
1SG DES give 2 go
'I want you to go'

(35) *dɛ̀h*$_i$ *hùʔ* ***mòc*** ***kɒ*** Ø$_{≠i}$ *ciəʔ* *hənɔm.*
3 NEG DES give eat noodles
'He doesn't want (me, you, etc.) to eat noodles.'

These constructions can be analyzed as biclausal 'I want to let you go', taking *kɒ* 'give, let' as matrix predicate with the S/A of the subordinate clause obligatorily non-coreferential with the matrix S. As in other subordinate clauses, the word order is fixed as SV, AVP, AVGT, though extraction of the controllee can appear sentence intially in the LDP.

Control verbs in Mon obviously always select either S or A as controllee, defining once again the set {S. A} as relevant grammatical relation.

3.6 *Reflexives*

The noun *həkaoʔ* 'body' is used in Mon to express reflexive meaning. As a reflexive pronoun, *həkaoʔ* can combine directly with the antecedent, usually a personal name or other noun denoting a human or human-like referent. This is seen in examples (36) and (37), in the former with the antecedent preceding the reflexive, in the latter following it. In (36) the reflexive functions as oblique, in (37) as P argument.

(36) *thɔ.nətì* *chak* *mìt* *kɒ* ***həkaoʔ*** *thɔ.nətì* *kla.*
PN connect friend OBL body PN before
'Thaw Nadi first became friends with herself.' (saksoy_hongsa)

(37) ***həkaoʔ*** *nɔ̀n.say* *nɔ̀n.say* *tɛm* *mɔ̀ŋ.*
body PN PN know stay
'Non Sai knew about herself.' (saksoy_hongsa)

In example (38), the reflexive occurs alone, with the antecedent S/A preceding it. In this sentence it functions as P argument of the second part of the predicate, which consists of two transitive verbs, *kəpac* 'dash' and *phyeh* 'let fall down' respectively. The intransitive verb *toc* 'sleep, lie down', though part of the multi-verb predicate, does not have an effect on the transitivity value of the whole predicate.

(38) *wətɒə* *lɛ* *toc* *kəpɒc* *phyeh* ***həkaoʔ,*** *dɒp* *lɛ*
PN ADD sleep dash CAUS.descend body head ADD

hùʔ *kɤ̀ʔ* *chak* *mìt* *kɒ* *nì* *khɒh~khɒh* *nɛm* *kɔ̀h,* *mɔ̀ŋ* *ʔa*
NEG get connect friend OBL pillow good~RED yet MEDL hear go

hərùʔ *pəsaŋ* *mùə* *kəpac* *tɤʔ* *raʔ.*

NML.noisy sound one side DIST FOC

'Wati let herself down on the bed, and her head hadn't become good friends with the pillow yet, when she heard a noise from the other side.' (cl_ck_ca)

The antecedent may be overtly expressed in a clause not adjacent to the clause containing the reflexive, as seen in (39). The proper name Mi Kon Plem is expressed in the initial clause of the paragraph and is then omitted if it occurs as S or A in the following clauses. When the function changes to oblique, the reflexive is used to express coreferentiality with the preceding S/A arguments.

(39) ***mìʔ.kon.plɛm***$_i$ *kɔ̀h* *həlac* *tɒn* *ʔətao* *klɔ̌ŋ* *toə*
PN MEDL leap ascend on boat finish

"təŋèə *mùə* *nèʔ* *cɒʔ* *kɒ* *ŋùh* *mùə* *həke* *raʔ* *lè."*
sesame one basket put give price one tical FOC EMPH

rèə *sac* *wùʔ* *həkùt* *hɒm* *tao* *mɔ̀ŋ* *plun.plun* *raʔ.*
manner kind PROX beat.down speak stay stay over.and.over FOC

hɒm *mɔ̀ŋ* *rèə* *sac* *wùʔ* *lɛ* *kɒm* *dɔ̀ə* ***həkaoʔ***$_i$ *sɔn* *nùm* *chaʔ*
speak stay manner kind PROX ADD also LOC body silver exist EXCL

pəsɔn *həke* *kɔ̀h* *sɔh* *həɓah* *kwì* *rèə* *sac* *wùʔ.*
five tical MEDL solve show wrap manner kind PROX

'Mi Kon Plem leapt on ghe boat and said "Give me one basket of sesame seeds for the price of one tical." In this manner she beat down the price over and over. Speaking like this she also said that she had only five ticals, and she showed them the money wrapped in her loincloth.' (MKP)

The function of reflexive *həkaoʔ* is not limited to P or oblique roles, but can occur as S or A of a clause, as seen in (40). In this example the reflexive A of the first subordinate (complement) clause is bound by the following (omitted) A of the matrix verb *lèə* 'tell'. The second instance of the reflexive in this sentence denotes the possessor coreferential with the A of the main clause.

(40) *hə-tɔ̀h* *raʔ* ***həkaoʔ***$_{i,*j}$ *kəpɔʔ* *ɲàt* **Ø**$_i$ *kɔ̌ʔ* *ciəʔ* *kwaŋ* *kwì* *kɔ̀h*
NML-be FOC body dream see get eat sweets wrap MEDL

cəphɔn *kɔ̀h* **Ø**$_i$ *lèə* *həɓah* *kɒ* *kəlaʔ-hɒəʔ*$_j$ ***həkaoʔ***$_i$ *raʔ.*
while MEDL tell show OBL lord-house body FOC.

'Then she told her husband about herself dreaming that she ate wrapped sweets.' (MKP)

The antecedent of the reflexive *həkaoʔ* in any function may be the S or A of the matrix clause, that is, the reflexive is not bound by the A of its immediate clause. This use of the reflexive is similar to logophoric pronouns (see Huang 2000:172ff), reporting "the 'perspective' of an internal protagonist of a scene or discourse, as opposed to that of the current, external speaker" (Huang 2000:172). As the reflexive is in these cases used outside its immediate clause, this function corresponds to what has been described as "long distance reflexivization" (see Huang 2000:90ff). The use of *həkaoʔ* as reflexive with a role other than S or A can lead to ambiguous expressions, with only the context

determining whether the reflexive is bound by the immediate S or A, or whether the antecedent is beyond its immediate local domain. If *həkaoʔ* occurs in S or A function, only the long-distance interpretation is available, and the antecedent is, covertly or overtly, the S or A of the broader domain, most commonly the cognizer of the situation. Relevant examples are given in sentences (41) to (43) with the coreference indexes given as required by the respective contexts, not the grammatical structures.

(41) *hənàɣ nɔʔ wətʊə$_j$ kɔ̀h yɔ̀.raʔ tɔ̀h mɔ̀ŋ həmɔt wùt*
place PROX PN MEDL COND be stay young young.woman

kwan ***həkaoʔ$_{i,*j}$*** *raʔ mə= kɛ̀h,* ***mɔ̀n.sʊc$_i$*** *yɤ̀m lùə ɲìʔ nɛm ha.*
village body FOC REL=say PN breathe easy little yet Q

'If Wati was a girl of his (own) village, Mon Saik would breathe more easily, wouldn't he.' (cl_ck_ca)

(42) ***həkaoʔ$_i$*** *kɤ̀ʔ mìp toə həwɛ̀ʔ ɲɛ̀h$_j$ kənɔh mùʔ tɔ̀h ʔa màn*
body get happy finish life person other what be go win

kɔ̀h lɛ ***pɛ̀h$_i$*** *kiəŋ ku khyɔp lɔ̀ kʊm ha, wətʊə.*
MEDL ADD 2SG EXPER think consider deposit also Q PN

'If you are happy, have you also ever though how other people's lives could be, Wati?' (cl_ck_ca)

(43) *ʔiʔ-nɔʔ kɔ̀h mɔ̀n.sʊc$_j$ həlèt pɑɣ mɔ̀ŋ* ***həkaoʔ$_i$*** *raʔ,*
NML-PROX MEDL PN divert avoid stay body FOC

wətʊə$_i$ *kəmɔt ket raʔ.*
PN note take FOC

'Wati had noticed that Mon Saik had been avoiding her.' (cl_ck_ca)

If the reflexive *həkaoʔ* is bound by an antecedent in the same clause, the antecedent must be S or A, as seen in examples (44) and (45).

(44) *nətì$_i$ kʊ lɔ̀ rɔ̀t.mɔ̀n$_j$ rùp* ***dɛ̀h$_{i,j}$***.
PN give deposit PN picture 3
'Nadi gave Rot Mon a picture of her/him.'

(45) *nətì$_i$ kʊ lɔ̀ rɔ̀t.mɔ̀n$_j$ rùp* ***həkaoʔ$_{i,*j}$***.
PN give deposit PN picture body
'Nadi gave Rot Mon a picture of her.'

While the function of reflexive *həkaoʔ* in its clause is not limited to a set of specific grammatical roles, the antecedent binding the reflexive is always S or A at some level in the broader discourse context. This would hint to the set {S, A} as possible binding roles for reflexives in Mon.

3.7 *Conjunction reduction*

Known or retrievable arguments are regularly dropped in Mon, irrespective of the function of the omitted argument. This is also true if the function changes from one clause to another, and if there

are more than one unexpressed referents. In example (46), the coreferent A arguments of both clauses are omitted.

(46) A_i *kəpɔh* *həmoc* *toə* *ʔɒt,* A_i *klɔh* *thɒʔ* *na* *raʔ.*
collect garbage finish all throw discard CAUS.go FOC
'When we had collected all the garbage, we threw it away.' (KM_SR)

In (47) the overt S of the first clause is coreferent with the omitted A of the second clause, while in (48) both S of the first and coreferential A of the second clause are omitted.

(47) *cəpan$_i$* *lɛ* *khyɒt* *thɒʔ* *hùʔ* *ʔon* *pùh,* A_i *tɛ̀h* *pɔ̀ŋ* *lè.*
Japan ADD die discard NEG few NEG hit bomb EMPH
'Not few Japanese died, too. [They] were hit by bombs.' (WW2)

(48) *ʔiʔ-kɔ̀h* *toə,* S_i *cao* *hɒəʔ* *toə* A_i *ʔat* *pəchan* *ʔəmè* *plɔn.*
NML-MEDL finish return house finish beg money mother again
'After that [I] went back home and then [I] asked my mother for money again.' (KM_SR)

In example (49), only the P argument of the matrix clause is overtly expressed. The omitted S of the matrix clause is coreferential with the covert G of the subordinate clause, while the omitted A of the subordinate clause has a different referent.

(49) A_i *hùʔ* *kɒ* *həlah* G_j *ʔəkhoŋ* *pùh* *teh,* S_j *chak* *pèk* *mɔ̀ŋ*
NEG give free permission NEG TOP connect follow stay

ʔəwao *sɔrì* *dɛh* *kɔ̀h* *raʔ* *ha.*
older.brother PN 3 MEDL FOC Q

'If [they] don't give [you] permission (to leave the theater), will [you] keep following [your] brother Sawri?' (KM_SR)

In (50) the first person plural pronoun is omitted in all functions, namely G in the first clause and simultaneously P (object of *kɒ* 'give > let') and A (of *klon* 'make, work') and S (of *cù* rest') in the following two clauses.

(50) *pəyɒ* *yèh* *kɔ̀h* *teh* *ʔəŋàn* *mùə* *ŋuə* *dɛh* *kɒ* G_i ,
border shine MEDL TOP quota one day 3 give

dɛh *kwɒ* P/A_i *klon* *raʔ,* *dɛh* *kɒ* P/S_i *cù raʔ*
3 NEG.give make FOC 3 give rest FOC

ʔiʔ-kɔ̀h *dɛh* *kɒ* P/S_i *cù.*
NML-MEDL 3 give rest

'At dawn break they would give [us] the salary for one day, then they wouldn't let [us] work anymore, they let [us] rest.' (WW2)

In the chained events in (51) all arguments are omitted. The roles of the referents change from one clause to the next without any formal indication of this switched reference.

(51) *ʔiʔ-kɔ̀h* *toə,* S_i *kəliəŋ* *ʔa* *plɔn,* S_i *ʔa* *toə* A_i *pɔ̀* P_j *həyèh,*
NML-MEDL finish return go again go finish watch sing

A_j	*həyèh*	*kwèk*	*toə*	*dɛh*$_{j,k}$	*hùʔ*	*kɒ* P_i/A_i	*həyèh*	*raʔ.*
	sing	song	finish	3	NEG	give	sing	FOC

'After that [we] went back, [we] went back and [we] watched [them] sing. When [they] had finished singing, [they/he] wouldn't let [us] sing.' (KM_SR)

The preceding examples show that there is no restriction in the omitting of arguments in conjoined clauses. Arguments can be dropped irrespective of heir reference and grammatical function, and no change of reference or function (switch reference) is grammatically marked. In at least one conjunction type there is a restriction, though, namely in purposive clauses. Mon has two different purposive subordinators, s*wak* 'for' and *ɲɔ̀ŋ kə̀ʔ* 'so that'. The former is only used when the S or A argument of the matrix clause is coreferent with the S or A argument of the purposive clause. In both the matrix and the subordinate clause, S and A are treated identically. Relevant examples are given in (52) and (53).

(52)

swak	*Øi*	***kə̀ʔ***	*kə̀ʔ*	*kon.càt*	*kɔ̀h*	*lɛ*	*Øi*	*paʔ*	*wì*	*mɔ̀ŋ*	*mɔ̀ŋ*	*kɒm*	*raʔ.*
for		get	get	child	MEDL	ADD		do	effort	stay	stay	also	FOC

'They tried hard so that they would get a child.'

(53)

ɲɔ̀ŋ	*ʔiʔtèʔ.prèəi*	***kə̀ʔ***	*pɔŋ.cɒt*	*kao.plày*	*nɔʔ*	
as	younger.sister	get	agree	older.brother	PROX	
*Ø*i,j*	*kəlaŋ*	*ciəʔ*	*ʔərè*	*ʔiʔ.tèʔ.prèə*	*noŋ.*	
	listen	eat	language	younger.sister	ASRT	

'I will listen to your words, my dear sister, so that you agree (to be my wife).'

In purposive clauses, it is again S and A that trigger the choice of the subordinator, confirming {S, A} as a relevant set of argument roles.

Conjunction reduction in chained and some embedded clauses is therefore not always a valid means to define grammatical relations in Mon, though it is relevant at least in a limited number of embedded constructions, especially purposive clauses.

3.8 *Not relevant in Mon*

We have seen in sections 3.6 and 3.7 that the function of reflexives in their clause, as well as conjunction reduction, do not select any subsets of arguments, and can therefore not be seen as argument selectors. A number of other constructions, which are cross-linguistically typically involved in the selection of sets of arguments, are irrelevant to the notion of grammatical relations in Mon, either because they are not available in the language, or because they don't show any restrictions of the neutralization of arguments. An example of the former is agreement, which does not exist at all in Mon. The latter include relative clauses, raising (which is generally rare in Mon), and quantifier floating. All of these are available for all types of arguments and some types of adjuncts.

4. Conclusions

We have seen in section 3 that a number of constructions are relevant to identifying sets of

arguments in Mon. Not all constructions select the same sets, though {S, A} emerges as a firm grammatical relation in all relevant constructions. With the possible exception of SV-inversion (see 3.1), no construction is found that treats S differently from A. S always neutralizes semantic actor and undergoes, that is, there is no split S in any construction found in Mon. Based on the findings, 'subject' as covering S and A functions can be postulated as a valid notion in Mon. While subject as set {S, A} can be established in Mon, the case is less clear for object. P shares some constructional properties with T, others with G. Table 1 summarizes the constructions selecting {S, A}, {O, G}, and {O, T} as relevant sets.

construction	selected set
preverbal position	{S, A}
contrastive marking *kəpac*	{S, A}
derived P in morphological causatives	{S, A}
controllee in control expressions	{S, A}
affectee in multi-verb constructions with basic form of secondary verbs	{S, A}
antecedent of reflexive (long distance and clause internal)	{S, A}
coreferent in matrix clause and *swak* purposive clause	{S, A}
affectee in multi-verb constructions with causative secondary verbs	{P, T}
promoted to privileged syntactic argument in passive (where available)	{P, T}
immediate postverbal position	{P, G}

Table 1. Argument selectors

Based on the constructions presented in section 3, we can conclude that a few grammatical relations are relevant in a number of constructions in Mon, though they play a minor role in the overall grammatical structure of the language.

Sources:

cl_ck_ca	*Chan lon, chan kwaeh, chan awt.* Short story in colloquial style.
KM_SR	Conversation by two young men.
MKP	*Mi kon plem.* Novel in semi-colloquial style.
saksoy_hongsa	*Pa saksoy hongsawatoy.* Short story in colloquial style.
WW2	Conversation by two elderly people.

Abbreviations:

A agent; ADD additive; ADV adverbializer; ASRT assertive; CAUS causative; COND conditional; DES desiderative; DIST distal demonstrative; EMPH emphatic; EXCL exclusive focus; EXPER experiential; FOC focus; G goal/recipient; LOC locative; MEDL medial demonstrative; NEG negation; NML nominalizer; NSIT new situation; P patient; OBL oblique; PN proper name; PROX proximal demonstrative; RED reduplication; REL relativizer; RSTR restrictive focus; S single

argument; SG singular; T theme; TOP topic; Q question

References

Bickel, Balthasar. 2011. Grammatical Relations typology. In Jae Jung Song (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 399-444.

Enfield, Nick. 2009. 'Case relations' in Lao, a radically isolating language. In Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer. *The Oxford handbook of case.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 808-19.

Hopper, Paul J. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56:2, 251-299.

Huang, Yan. 2000. *Anaphora. A cross-linguistic study.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenny, Mathias. 2005. *The verb system of Mon.* Zurich: ASAS.

Jenny, Mathias. 2009. Deixis and information structure in Mon. The multifunctional particle *kòh*. In JSEALS 2, 53-71.

Jenny, Mathias. 2011. Burmese syntax in Mon - external influence and internal development. In Sophana Srichampa, Paul Sidwell and Kenneth Gregerson (eds.) *Austroasiatic Studies: papers from ICAAL4. Mon-Khmer Studies Journal Special Issue* No. 3, 48-64.

Jenny, Mathias. forthc. Transitive directionals in Mon. To appear in *Austroasiatic Studies 5.*

Jenny, Mathias & San San Hnin Tun. 2013. Differential subject marking without ergativity - the case of colloquial Burmese. *Studies in Language* 37:4, 693-735.

Kittilä, Seppo. 2002. *Transitivity: towards a comprehensive typology.* Turku: University of Turku.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical transitivity.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nai Sac Lun. 2013. *English grammar explained in Mon.* Fort Wayne.

Shibatani 1990 The languages of Japan

Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. & Randy LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax. Structure, meaning and function.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena. 2011. *Typological variation in Grammatical Relations.* Leipzig: University of Leipzig doctoral dissertation.